

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20-67 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on May 6, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' attorney discussed the outstanding rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to independent Claim 1. The substance of that discussion is reflected in the remarks below.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20-67 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regards to independent Claim 1, the Examiner alleges that the claim is indefinite because the role of the controlling device is not clear and confusing. The Examiner asserts that the claim starts with one definite controlling device which manages other embedded devices in a network. The Examiner further asserts that the claim later recites any one of the embedded devices is operable to be the controlling device, which makes the identity and the role of the controlling device confusing.

Applicants have amended the Claims. Specifically, Applicants have clarified the identity of the controlling device in the relevant Claims. As such, Applicants respectfully

request withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection against Claims 1-6, 8-18, and 20-67.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 -3, 5, 8, 11, 13-16, 20, 23, 25, 35, 30-33, 36, 39, 41-43, 45, 50-52, 56, and 62-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,279,067 to Callaway et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claim 1 recites, inter alia, a method that includes “receiving without executing a query, at a first embedded device of a plurality of embedded devices, a request to transmit data on a communications link from a second embedded device of the plurality of embedded devices.” At a minimum, the Callaway et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the video graphics system, as depicted in Callaway et al., operates in a manner that discloses the method as recited by independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. The method and apparatus of Callaway et al. disclose detecting an interrupt request in a video graphics system “by reading a shared interrupt request flag stored in a device.” Callaway et al. further notes that, “When the shared interrupt flag is set, a pending interrupt request exists and notification of the pending interrupt request is forwarded to an interrupt service routine. If the shared interrupt flag is not set, the circuitry which is polling the interrupt request flag delays for a polling interval and the repeats the steps...” (Column 2, Lines 35-47). In other words, the VIP host device 10 of Callaway et al. (i.e., the controlling device as asserted by the Examiner) must poll or query one of the VIP slave devices (e.g., VIP slaves 30 or 40) to determine whether an interrupt request is pending. In support of this interpretation, Applicants note that the Figure 2 of

Callaway et al. depicts the VIP host 10 having a polling block 12 that reads (i.e., queries) the shared interrupt request flag of at one of the VIP slave devices to determine if an interrupt request is pending.

In contrast, the method of independent Claim 1 calls for a method that includes receiving a request to transmit data at a first embedded device without first executing a query to determine the existence of the data transmission request. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Callaway et al. fails to anticipate independent Claim 1. Applicants also submit that a number of the Examiner's other assertions regarding Callaway et al. are incorrect. However these issues are moot given the preceding discussion.

Because Callaway et al. fails to teach each and every element of independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection against independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims be removed. Applicants note that independent Claims 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56, and 62, at a minimum, each recite a feature similar to the feature of independent Claim 1 described above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections against independent Claims 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56 and 62 and their respective dependent claims be removed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 22, 27-29, 34, 37, 38, 44, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaway et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Each of the dependent Claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 22, 27-29, 34, 37, 38, 44, and 61 depend directly or indirectly from respective independent Claims, thus, are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the independent Claims. As such,

Applicants respectfully request the rejections against dependent Claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 22, 27-29, 34, 37, 38, 44, and 61 be removed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4225.

Respectfully submitted,

May 30, 2008
Date

/Jason C. White/
Jason C. White
Reg. No. 42,223
Abhishek Rastogi
Attorneys for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4719